

## REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response, applicant has amended Claim 8 to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

More particularly, applicant has amended Claim 8 by replacing “NWF” with “non-woven fabric.” This amendment finds support at, *inter alia*, page 6, lines 12-13. Additionally, at the Examiner’s suggestion, Claim 8 has been further amended by replacing “PVC” with “polyvinyl chloride”. In regards to Claim 11, applicant avers that the Claim, as written, is not indefinite. Applicant has defined the term “series of hairs” at page 5, lines 2-8 (See also FIGS. 2 and 4). Therefore, applicant respectfully requests removal of this ground of rejection.

The Examiner then rejected Claims 1-11 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brown et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,100,208. In response, applicant has amended Claim 1 by adding a limitation, not found in the cited prior art, relating to the ratio between the width and thickness of the interlacing yarns or bands. This is not new subject matter and finds support at, *inter alia*, page 4, line 24 to page 5, line 1. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests removal of this ground of rejection.

The Examiner then rejected Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,100,208. In response, applicant has amended Claim 1 by adding a limitation, not found in the cited prior art, relating to the ratio between the width and thickness of the interlacing yarns or bands. This is not new subject matter and finds support at, *inter alia*, page 4, line 24 to page 5, line 1. Since the present invention is now more limited than the cited prior art, applicant avers that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Brown in order to develop the present invention. Therefore, since Claim 12 depends from Claim 1, applicant respectfully requests removal of this ground of rejection.


The Examiner then rejected Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,100,208 in view of Gillem, U.S. Patent No. 5,029,933 and JP 20000108685. In response, applicant has amended Claim 1 by

adding a limitation, not found in the cited prior art, relating to the ratio between the width and thickness of the interlacing yarns or bands. This is not new subject matter and finds support at, *inter alia*, page 4, line 24 to page 5, line 1. Since the present invention is now more limited than the cited prior art, applicant avers that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Brown with the disclosure of Gillem in order to develop the present invention. More particularly, the limitation as relates to ratio between width and thickness of the interlacing yarns or bands is not taught or suggested in Brown, Gillem, or a combination of the two references. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests removal of this ground of rejection.

Lastly, applicant has amended claim 9 to correct a typographical error. No new matter was added by this amendment.

In light of the foregoing applicant respectfully submits that that the claims of the present application are in proper form for allowance. Favorable consideration and early allowance are therefore respectfully requested and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James V. Costigan  
Reg. No. 25,669

MAILING ADDRESS

Hedman & Costigan, P.C.  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
(212) 302-8989